




**PUBLIC COPY**

**Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy**

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS  
425 Eye Street N.W.  
ULLB, 3rd Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20536




File: EAC 00 249 51942 Office: Vermont Service Center

Date:

**JAN 31 2003**

IN RE: Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:



Petition: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional Pursuant to § 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(3)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



**INSTRUCTIONS:**

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,  
EXAMINATIONS

*Robert P. Wiemann*  
Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center. The Associate Commissioner for Examinations dismissed a subsequent appeal, affirming the director's decision. The matter is now before the Associate Commissioner on a motion to reopen. The motion will be granted, the previous decisions of the director and Associate Commissioner will be affirmed, and the petition will be denied.

The petitioner is a bakery. It seeks classification of the beneficiary pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(3), and it seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a cake decorator. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had the financial ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage as of the filing date of the petition. On June 2, 2002, the Associate Commissioner affirmed that decision, dismissing the appeal. On motion, counsel submits additional evidence.

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(3)(A)(i), provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who are capable, at the time of petitioning for classification under this paragraph, of performing skilled labor (requiring at least two years training or experience), not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States.

8 C.F.R. 204.5(g)(2) states in pertinent part:

*Ability of prospective employer to pay wage.* Any petition filed by or for an employment-based immigrant which requires an offer of employment must be accompanied by evidence that the prospective United States employer has the ability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner must demonstrate this ability at the time the priority date is established and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. Evidence of this ability shall be either in the form of copies of annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements.

On motion, counsel submits a copy of the U.S. Form 1040, Individual Income Tax Return, bank statements, an unaudited financial statement, and a statement of an account with an investment broker. That tax return and those statements pertain to the personal finances of the owners of the petitioning corporation. Counsel states that those documents demonstrate the ability to pay the proffered wage.

The petitioner is a corporation. The petitioner's burden is to show that the petitioner, the corporation itself, had the ability to pay the proffered wage when the petition was submitted and has continued to have that ability. The Service may not pierce the corporate veil and look to the assets of the corporation's owner to satisfy the corporation's ability to pay the proffered wage. A corporation is a separate and distinct legal entity from its owners or stockholders. Consequently, any assets of the individual stockholders cannot be considered in determining the petitioning corporation's ability to pay the proffered wage. See Matter of M, 8 I&N Dec. 24 (BIA 1958; AG 1958); Matter of Aphrodite Investments Limited, 17 I&N Dec. 530 (Comm. 1980); and Matter of Tessel, 17 I&N Dec. 631 (Act. Assoc. Comm. 1980).

The documentation submitted does not establish that the petitioner had sufficient available funds to pay the proffered wage. Therefore, the decision of the Associate Commissioner has not been overcome on the motion.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1361. The petitioner has not met that burden. Accordingly, the previous decisions of the director and the Associate Commissioner will be affirmed, and the petition will be denied.

**ORDER:** The Associate Commissioner's decision of June 2, 2002 is affirmed. The petition is denied.

RECEIVED  
JUN 11 2002  
JUN 11 2002